

REMARKS

Claim rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 16-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Okada (2002/0018237). Claims 1, 5, and 18 are independent claims, from which the remaining claims ultimately depend. Applicant submits that as previously presented, claims 1, 5, and 18 are patentable over Okada, such that all the pending claims are patentable over Okada.

In the previous office action response, Applicant explained how Okada's embodiments as relied upon by the Examiner are directed to fax transmission. By comparison, as also explained in the previous office action response, the claimed invention is directed to distributing a *received* fax that has been received by intended recipients. Applicant again submits that this distinction renders Okada as not anticipating the claimed invention.

The Examiner has stated that:

[A]pplicant argues Okada is directed to a transmitter as opposed to a receiver. But claim 1 is directed toward a distribution of a facsimile and no language specifying a "receiver" is claimed. Furthermore, there is neither receiver nor other means for acquiring the facsimile as claimed. At best the claim provides for "notification" as to identifying a fax which may or may not be acquired.

(Final office action, p. 8.) Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1, which is discussed herein as representative of all the independent claims insofar as the rejection over Okada is concerned, explicitly recites "receiving said facsimile as received at a specified phone number of each intended recipient of said facsimile." As such, it is crystal clear that claim 1 is directed to distributing a facsimile that has been received. A facsimile that is received at a phone number of an intended recipient is a received facsimile. For example, if I have a phone number to which a fax machine is attached, I can receive faxes sent to this phone number – someone sends me a fax by having his or her fax machine dial the phone number of my fax machine.

Applicant also notes that claim 1 recites "storing said facsimile on a storage media at a specific location," "identifying an Internet enabled device associated with each intended recipient of said facsimile," and "notifying each identified Internet enabled device of said specific location for said saved facsimile." Thus, a fax is received at a phone number of an intended recipient, and

is stored on a storage media at a specific location. An Internet enabled device associated with this intended recipient is identified, and is notified as to where the facsimile is saved. There is no question that the entirety of claim 1, as well as the other independent claims, is directed towards distributing a fax that has been received at a phone number of a recipient with which an Internet enabled device is associated. While the term “receiver” is not used in the claim language, the term “recipient” is. Thus, where Okada’s embodiments relied upon by the Examiner are directed to fax *transmission*, and where the claimed invention is explicitly directed to notifying an Internet enabled device as to the location of a *received* fax, where the Internet enabled device is associated with an intended *recipient* of this fax, and where this fax been *received* at a specified phone number of the intended recipient, Okada just cannot be considered as anticipating the claimed invention.

The Examiner goes on to say that:

[T]he applicant’s salient point is that Okada fails to provide, “. . . notifying each identified Internet enabled device of said specific location for said saved facsimile so that the identified Internet enabled device can later retrieve said saved facsimile from said specific location.”

At paragraph 60, Okada explains that PC 211 is the requesting node *which requests a fax transmission*. The last three lines of para. 60 states that an e-mail address of the PC 211 is attached to the facsimile data. Hence, this e-mail address serves as a notification of the fax PC 211 that fax data has been stored in data storage section 5.

(Final office action, p. 9.) Again, however, the claimed invention is not directed to notifying an Internet enabled device associated with a *fax transmitter* like the PC 211 as to where a facsimile is stored in the process of being *transmitted*. Rather, the claimed invention is explicitly directed to notifying an Internet enabled device associated with an intended *recipient* of a facsimile as to where the facsimile is stored – where the facsimile is explicitly *received* at a specified phone number of the intended recipient. Okada just does not disclose the identical invention that is being claimed. In Okada, a fax transmitter transmits a fax, and may have an Internet enabled device that may be notified where the fax is stored. By comparison, in the claimed invention, a

recipient has a fax *received* at a phone number of the *recipient*, and an Internet enabled device associated with the *recipient* is notified where the received fax has been saved.

For these reasons, Applicant again submits that Okada does not anticipate the claimed invention.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

May 6, 2008
Date

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
1474 N Cooper Rd #105-248
Gilbert, AZ 85233
tel: 425-427-5094
fax: 425-563-2098